

Mr. CAMP's amendment. If Mr. CAMP's amendment is enacted, middle-income families, including 49,000 in my friend's, Mr. CAMP's, district will not see the lower 5 percent rate or the 10 percent rate that he promises. Twenty-six million families will pay higher taxes this year under the Camp proposal because of alternative minimum tax.

We will enact a patch this year so that those 26 million families will be protected from higher taxes. I guarantee you that. In fact, the Senate has already added it to their stimulus bill. But let's not fool ourselves today by voting for an AMT fig leaf and even steeper rate cuts which will leave the middle-income worker holding the bag.

I urge opposition to the Republican amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I would commend Mr. NEAL for his work on the AMT. I just wish you had included it in your underlying bill. But let me just say, look, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, is nonpartisan. It has said that, and economists alike have said that tax cuts impact the economy more quickly than government spending. And what we need to do is act quickly and effectively.

We even have an analysis by the senior adviser to the new President who says that tax cuts will actually have more immediate growth, more job creation and a bigger bang for the buck than we'll see with government spending. And when we use the same methods and economic models that they have used to analyze our legislation, we get twice as many jobs for half the cost because of the great generative power of tax relief. It is something that certainly both President Kennedy and President Reagan recognized to create economic growth.

Let's be clear about what tax relief actually does. The U.S. economy had significant job growth after the tax cuts in the early part of this decade. Between 2003 and 2008, the economy added almost 8 million jobs. As this chart shows, it's according to the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. economy added these jobs even after dealing with the impact of 9/11, two wars, rising energy prices and government spending.

Now everyone knows that over the last year, the U.S. economy has lost a significant number of jobs, but it took an unprecedented crisis in the housing and financial markets and a world economic slowdown to really knock the economy and the jobs that the economy creates off its feet.

So our estimate of the number of jobs that could be created by these tax relief measures, as we readily acknowledge, cannot fully account for all of the potential impacts on the economy, just as the President's senior advisers note

in their analysis the same thing. But we do know the U.S. economy was in recession when Congress enacted the 2001 and 2003 tax relief measures. The U.S. economy responded by growing rapidly and adding almost 8 million jobs. And the families and the prosperity that was created from those 8 million jobs followed.

So the tax relief, the approach we have taken in our bill to emphasize more tax relief minimizes the wasteful government spending that we see in the Democrat, or the present majority's approach, and really shows that it's a proven formula for stimulating the economy, creating jobs and lifting this economy out of a recession.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this wrong-headed substitute amendment offered by my Republican colleagues.

The Camp/Cantor amendment eliminates two key health care provisions in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. First, it deletes the entire investment in health information technology. Second, it eliminates the provisions designed to temporarily provide health insurance for workers who've lost their jobs in this economic crisis.

For years, I've heard my Republican colleagues laud the need to invest in health information technology. Yet, when a bill comes before them that finally meets that goal, what do they do? They delete it.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 1 will dramatically increase physician use of health IT from 5 percent today to 90 percent. It will also increase hospital adoption rates from about 10 percent today to 70 percent.

CBO further tells us that the steps this bill takes to increase adoption will reduce what both the public and private sectors pay for health care by lowering administrative overhead costs, reducing the number of unnecessary tests and procedures, and decreasing many avoidable medical errors.

Specifically, CBO says the federal government will save \$12 billion across government health programs and consumers will save billions more via lower premiums for private insurance.

With regard to health care coverage, I've also listened to my Republican colleagues for decades as they insist that any effort toward expanding health coverage build on what works in the private sector. COBRA continuation coverage does just that.

COBRA coverage enables people who have lost their jobs to maintain their private health insurance coverage through their former employer for a limited period of time—at their own cost—until they get a new job with health benefits.

All we do in H.R. 1 is provide a temporary 65 percent subsidy for up to 12 months for workers who have been involuntarily terminated in this recession. Many of these people are surviving on unemployment compensation—the monthly value of which is often less than the standard monthly family COBRA premium of more than \$1000.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that some 7 million Americans will be able to maintain their health coverage if this provision is enacted.

What does the Republican substitute do to this provision? It deletes it.

Clearly, my Republican colleagues are turning their back on this historic opportunity to modernize America's health IT system and reduce overall health spending. They are also telling America's workers that their health care needs are their own problem—even though this recession is a direct result of the lax oversight they and President Bush proceeded over for the past decade.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this mean spirited substitute amendment.

Mr. CAMP. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California) assumed the chair.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 181. To amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

The Committee resumed its sitting.

##### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 111-9 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were